REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 are currently pending, Claims 1, 3, 7, and 9 having been amended, Claim 10 having been added, and Claim 5 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. The changes and additions to the claims do not add new matter and are supported by the originally filed specification, for example, on page 10, lines 12-14.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Funato et al (U.S. Pub. No. 20060025161, hereinafter "Funato") in view of Castelluccia et al. ("An Adaptive Per-Host IP Paging Architecture", hereinafter "Castelluccia").

Applicant thanks the examiner for the courtesy of a telephone interview with Applicant's representative, Mr. Sameer Gokhale, on August 18, 2011. During the interview, Mr. Gokhale explained the Applicant's invention to the examiner and discussed the outstanding rejections. Proposed clarifying amendments were also discussed. No agreement was reached and the examiner will reconsider the outstanding rejections after a formal response is filed.

With respect to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection and further submit that the present clarifying amendment to Claim 1 overcomes this ground of rejection. Amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

> wherein the paging area forming unit is configured
> to form the paging area of the mobile terminal by an
> algorithm of the plurality of algorithms which is associated
> with an application that is started by the mobile terminal
> and that is related to a communication use of the mobile
> terminal, wherein the application is one of a plurality of
> applications on the mobile terminal that are each pre-
> associated with a respective algorithm of the plurality of

algorithms and that include at least an e-mail application.

As previously presented, Funato is directed to a method for automatically reconfiguring a paging area in a telecommunications system. Funato discloses a system which includes a mobile host 902 and last hop routers 904 and 906 (see Fig. 9). The mobile host 902 has a host reporter agent (HRA) 908 and each of the last hop routers has a paging area clustering agent 920. The HRA 908 is responsible for reporting movement of the mobile host to the paging area clustering agent 920 (see para. [0064]). Fig. 20 further shows how the HRA operates. The HRA includes a reporter process (REPF) 2002, a previous location table (PLT) 2004 and a current location table (CLT) 2006. The REPF updates the PLT and the CLT and registers the mobile host with a new area. The REPF also reports paging area movement to the paging area clustering agent 920.

The Examiner acknowledges that Funato fails to disclose or suggest that the claimed "algorithm" for forming the paging area is associated with an application started by the mobile terminal. (See Office Action, at page 4). The Examiner relies on Castelluccia to remedy this deficiency of Funato with regard to Claim 1.

The Examiner cites to Section 4.1-4.3 of newly cited Castelluccia, which describes a Paging Area Configuration Agent (PACA) that is responsible for configuring an optimal paging area shape relative to each cell of a domain. More specifically, Sections 4.1-4.3 respectively describe a problem to be overcome, a definition of a sampling algorithm, and paging area composition procedure.

However, as discussed during the interview, these cited portions of Castelluccia do not explicitly disclose an algorithm being associated with an application according to a communication use of the mobile terminal, the application being started by the mobile terminal, as required by previous Claim 1.

The Examiner explained during the interview that additional portions of Castelluccia

render the above-noted claimed feature obvious. Specifically, the Examiner pointed out that

Section 3.3.1 a host (i.e., a mobile terminal) performs registration to obtain a paging area.

The Examiner indicated that an *application for performing registration*, which inherently is

on the host, constitutes an application according to a communication use of the mobile that is

associated with a selected algorithm for forming a paging area.

However, amended Claim 1 recites "an application that is started by the mobile

terminal and that is related to a communication use of the mobile terminal, *wherein the*

application is one of a plurality of applications on the mobile terminal that are each pre-

associated with a respective algorithm of the plurality of algorithms and that include at

least an e-mail application,"

Applicants submit that Castelluccia clearly does not disclose an algorithm for forming

a paging area being associated with an application from among applications that are each pre-

associated with a respective algorithm of the plurality of algorithms and that include that

include at least an e-mail application.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 (and all associated

dependent claims) patentably distinguishes over Funato and Castelluccia, either alone or in

proper combination.

Amended independent Claims 3, 7, and 9 recite features similar to those of amended

Claim 1 discussed above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims

3, 7, and 9 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguish over Funato.

With respect to the rejection of dependent Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a),

Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection. Claim 4 recites, *inter alia*,

> a processing language specifying unit configured to
> specify, to the controller apparatus, a processing language
> in which an algorithm for forming the paging area is
> written;
> wherein the algorithm specifying unit is configured
> to specify the algorithm written in the processing language

8

> when a result of determination that the processing language
> can be handled is received from the controller apparatus.

The Examiner cited to paragraphs [0051], [0073], [0074], and [0082] as disclosing the above-noted features of Claim 4. Applicants also note that dependent Claim 6 recites features similar to Claim 4, but the Examiner cited to paragraphs [0064], [0083]-[0086], [0145], and Figs. 9 and 20, for this claim. However, none of these cited portions mentions anything about a device first specifying to another device *the processing language* for which an algorithm for forming a paging area is written, and *then specifying the actual algorithm to the other device once it is determined that the other device can handle the processing language*.

Therefore, Applicants submit that the Office Action has not properly shown how the applied art discloses the features of Claims 4 and 6, and therefore Applicants submit that the rejection of Claims 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) must be withdrawn.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested. Furthermore, the examiner is kindly invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the phone number below to resolve any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Sameer Gokhale
Registration No. 62,618